

## IV - GENERAL ASSEMBLY—IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101–246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” For the 57th UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2002, 15 votes meet these criteria.

Section IV has five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 15 important votes at the 57th UNGA (14 votes in the Plenary and one in the First Committee); (2) a listing and description of the 19 important consensus actions at the 57th UNGA (18 resolutions adopted in the Plenary and one decision); (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important resolutions adopted by votes, arranged both alphabetically by country and in rank order of agreed votes; (4) voting coincidence percentages by UN regional groups and other important groups; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section III. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts three and four above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 18 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, these coincidence percentages were refined to reflect a country’s rate of participation in all UN voting overall. The participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes–No–Abstain votes cast by a UN member in Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes (106).

### IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 15 important votes are identified by a short title, document number, date of vote, and results (Yes–No–Abstain), with the U.S. vote noted. The first paragraph gives a summary description of the resolution using language from the resolution (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), and the subsequent paragraphs provide background and explain the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in numerical order. This section includes one draft resolution, listed last, that was not voted on in the General Assembly because it was defeated in the First Committee.

#### 1. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Report

**A/Res/57/9**                      November 11                      138(US)–1–2

Affirms its confidence in the International Atomic Energy Agency’s (IAEA) role in the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; reaffirms the importance of the application of IAEA safeguards in the Middle East; commends IAEA efforts to implement the safeguards agreement in force

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

between the IAEA and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK); expresses concern over continuing non-compliance of the DPRK with the safeguards agreement and urges the full cooperation of the DPRK with the IAEA on the implementation of the safeguards agreement; commends IAEA efforts to implement all relevant Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq and calls upon Iraq to cooperate fully with IAEA to provide immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access; notes that the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management entered into force in June 2001 and appeals to states to become parties to the Convention in time to attend the first review meeting to be held in November 2003; urges states to participate in the 2003 International Conference on Safety of Transport of Radioactive Material; commends IAEA on its constructive response relevant to the improvement of nuclear security and protection against nuclear terrorism, noting arrangements for funding of the Nuclear Security Fund through voluntary contributions; and calls on member states to provide the Nuclear Security Fund the political and financial support it needs.

The United States voted in favor of this resolution, as did the vast majority of UN members. It is significant that the only negative vote was cast by the DPRK. Iraq's voting rights this year were suspended because it was in arrears.

2. U.S. Embargo Against Cuba

**A/Res/57/11**                      November 12                      173-3(US)-4

Calls on states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures such as the "Helms-Burton Act," whose extra-territorial consequences allegedly affect the sovereignty of other states and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction and the freedom of trade and navigation; urges states to repeal such laws.

The United States again voted No because the U.S. trade embargo is a matter of bilateral trade policy that is not an appropriate subject for UN consideration. The United States chooses to limit its trade with Cuba because of that country's repressive policies and actions, but does not forbid other nations from doing so. In the U.S. view, the focus of the international community should be on Cuba's failure to respect internationally recognized human rights rather than criticizing U.S. bilateral efforts that are aimed at encouraging a peaceful transition to democracy. Israel and the Marshall Islands also voted No; Ethiopia, Malawi, Nicaragua, and Uzbekistan abstained.

IV - General Assembly Important Votes

3. National Legislation on Transfer of Arms

**A/Res/57/66**                      November 11      166(US)–0–0

Invites states to enact or improve national legislation, regulations, and procedures over the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods, and technology; encourages states to provide information on this legislation to the Secretary-General; reporting is voluntary and involves no new obligations.

The Dutch Government sponsored this new resolution to complement their traditional resolution on transparency in conventional armaments. The United States is a strong supporter of the Netherlands' traditional transparency in armaments initiative, and supported this new resolution urging nations to conform their controls on the transfer of arms, military equipment, and dual-use goods and technology to Western standards. Iran called for a separate paragraph vote on part of this language, thus requiring a formal vote on what was essentially a consensus resolution.

4. Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

**A/Res/57/78**                      November 22      156–2(US)–13

Reaffirms the importance of achieving the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; stresses the importance of practical steps to implement the Treaty, such as the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), as well as an appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament; calls on all states to redouble their efforts to prevent and curb the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and maintain the highest possible standards of security, safe custody, effective control, and physical protection of all materials that could contribute to the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

This resolution calls for the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate a phased program of time-bound nuclear disarmament, focusing only on the nuclear-weapon states, blaming them solely for the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament, and asserting that the time is ripe for countries to pursue the total elimination of nuclear weapons and to de-emphasize their role. It is brought before the General Assembly annually by Myanmar on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and is the traditional centerpiece of NAM efforts on nuclear disarmament at the UNGA. Its appeal is basically aimed at hard-line NAM nuclear disarmament states, and its main purpose is to demonstrate the NAM's voting strength on issues of this nature.

The United States strongly opposed this resolution and encouraged others to do so as well. The United States is prepared to engage in nuclear reductions at the appropriate time, and in the appropriate context, but it sees no security value in engaging in global multilateral negotiations in the CD on the reduction

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

of its nuclear weapons. Such negotiations would risk interfering with the U.S. nuclear reductions policy, and the United States also opposes criticism of nuclear deterrence. India joined the United States in opposing this resolution, while other western states abstained.

5. Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in Middle East

**A/Res/57/97**                      November 22                      158–3(US)–0

Noting that Israel remains the only state in the Middle East that has not yet become a party to the Treaty on the Non–Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), calls on [Israel] to accede to that treaty, not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons, and to place all unsafeguarded nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as a confidence–building measure.

This resolution on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, annually sponsored by Egypt, singles out Israel, either directly or indirectly, and this year’s text remained unchanged from 2001 and 2000. In recent years, more sophisticated tactics by the sponsors, and increased Israeli vulnerability as the only Middle East country that has not become a party to the treaty on the NPT, have made this resolution a more complex challenge. The resolution singles out Israel for criticism in three separate paragraphs while omitting any references to compliance issues in Middle East states (such as Iraq) or the need for strict compliance.

The United States voted against this resolution on proliferation, as the U.S. has every year since this one–sided initiative took shape. The resolution did not meet the fundamental test of fairness and balance. The text confined itself to expressions of concern about activities of a single country, whereas it omitted any reference to other questions and issues that relate to the problem of nuclear weapons proliferation in the region. For example, the draft resolution did not mention the Middle East country (Iraq) that was found to be noncompliant with the NPT. It likewise did not allude to the steps that some nations in the region took to develop the capacity to acquire nuclear weapons, even though they are parties to the NPT. Further, there was no comment in the text on the failure of some Middle East states to fulfill their NPT obligations by concluding safeguard agreements, nor a recommendation that these states sign the IAEA’s Additional Safeguards Protocol. The United States regretted the resolution’s selective use of one–sided passages from the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. This political distortion of the NPT regime, in the U.S. view, did not advance the cause of nonproliferation.

The European Union and other Western Group countries continued their support of this resolution, while Israel and Micronesia joined the United States in voting against it.

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

6. Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

**A/Res/57/124**      November 22      86–6(US)–66

Commends the work of the Special Committee, demands that Israel cooperate with the Special Committee in implementing its mandate, deplores the policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people, expresses grave concern about the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (including East Jerusalem), requests the Special Committee to continue its investigation, and requests the Secretary-General to provide the Committee with all the necessary facilities to continue its work.

The United States voted against this resolution because the Special Committee was given a one-sided mandate to investigate only Israeli practices and not human rights abuses committed by the Palestinian Authority or the acts of terror perpetrated by Palestinian militant groups. These groups supported and encouraged terrorist attacks that killed Israeli civilians. Although the United States is acutely aware of the suffering of the Palestinian people, supporting resolutions so detached from reality cannot help alleviate that suffering or contribute to a solution of the problem. Also, the funds expended on the work of the Special Committee would be better spent to provide direct assistance to needy Palestinians.

7. Future Operations of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW)

**A/Res/57/175**      December 18      136–7(US)–29

Welcomes the report of the Working Group on future operations of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW), endorses its recommendations, and asks the Secretary-General to implement them in the context of his reform program; stresses the critical importance of voluntary contributions by member states to the Institute Trust Fund; and asks the Secretary-General to appoint, in consultation with the Working Group, a Director with expertise in gender issues and social research.

While the United States supports the advancement of women around the world, it could not support this resolution's endorsing certain recommendations of the INSTRAW Working Group. The Working Group called for allocating \$500,000 each year to INSTRAW from the regular budget. The United States, noting that it was not convinced that INSTRAW was making worthwhile contributions to improving the situation of women and that its accomplishments to date, including the Gender Awareness Information and Networking System (GAINS), have been only marginally useful, held that INSTRAW should remain voluntarily funded, and that governments that favor

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

its work may contribute to its operations and projects. In consideration of current budget restraints, and of the scarcity of contingency funds available for the remainder of the budget biennium, the strong view of the United States was that INSTRAW should not absorb scarce resources and force the deferral of other priority programs of the UN that would have greater beneficial effect.

8. Rights of the Child

**A/Res/57/190**      December 18      175–2(US)–0

Reaffirms and welcomes all of the resolutions and commitments on the rights of the child and the need to further integrate issues of child rights in the outcome documents of all major UN conferences, special sessions, and summits; urges states to ratify or accede to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CROC), and to fully implement the Convention; calls for protection of rights of children, and especially those in particularly vulnerable situations; calls for the eradication of the sale of children and child prostitution, the elimination of child labor, and protection of children affected by armed conflict; recognizes, in this regard, the contribution of the International Criminal Court to ending impunity for perpetrators of certain crimes against children.

The United States is not a state party to the Convention, and requested changes in the language from “states” to “states parties.” The United States also lobbied to amend a paragraph in the resolution that contained an unacceptable formulation on the International Criminal Court (ICC). Since these changes did not occur, the United States felt it necessary to vote No. In explaining its vote, the United States emphasized its strong commitment to the protection of the human rights of children and its disagreement on the formulations on the CROC and ICC. Also voting No was the Marshall Islands.

9. The Fight against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance and the Comprehensive Implementation of and Follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Program of Action

**A/Res/57/195**      December 18      173–3(US)–2

Endorses comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Program of Action; requests the implementation of the Program of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination; also takes note of the report and work of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and calls upon all states to cooperate with the rapporteur and give serious consideration to any request from the rapporteur to visit their countries.

In voting against this resolution, the United States pointed to its opposition to mechanisms called for in the Durban Conference’s Program of Action. The

#### IV - General Assembly Important Votes

United States was not part of the agreement to adopt the Durban Declaration and Program of Action and thus could not endorse its implementation. Also voting No were Israel and Palau, while Canada and Australia abstained.

##### 10. Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (DOPCAT)

**A/Res/57/199**      December 18      127–4(US)–42

Adopts the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and asks the Secretary-General to open it for signature, ratification, and accession from January 1, 2003; also provides for expenditures of the Subcommittee on Prevention established by the Protocol, to be borne by the regular UN budget.

The United States unequivocally condemns the practice of torture and is a party to the Convention against Torture. This Convention established the Committee Against Torture which is charged with considering complaints and conducting visits to countries where torture is alleged. The UN special rapporteur against torture, who regularly visits nations to ensure compliance of international norms, is strongly supported by the United States. The United States is also the largest contributor to the UN Voluntary Fund for the Victims of Torture. However, the United States believed that the DOPCAT was seriously flawed and excessively costly and, therefore, voted against this resolution. Among specific U.S. concerns was the fact that the Protocol would establish an additional international oversight body, independent from the Committee Against Torture, which would inspect detention facilities in all nations that are states party to the Protocol. Such visits would be scheduled in advance on a rotating basis for states parties, rather than conducted on an *ad hoc* basis. Because of the optional nature of this treaty body, many of the world's worst human rights offenders would not be subject to its provisions. Moreover, the Protocol would be financed out of the UN regular budget, forcing all states to pay in accordance with the UN's scale of assessments, whether or not they become parties to the Protocol. The United States believed that the DOPCAT would not enhance the work of the existing Committee Against Torture and other international instruments, but instead would compete for limited resources.

Finally, the resolution represented a significant departure from the long-standing preference for consensus in the formulation of new human rights instruments. In addition, the credibility of this instrument was greatly undermined by the fact that, despite originally being intended as a universal instrument, it was adopted in the Commission on Human Rights by a vote (with nearly as many negative votes and abstentions as votes in favor (29–10–14)), and by vote in the Economic and Social Council, before being considered by the General Assembly. In addition to the United States, the Marshall Islands, Nigeria, and Palau also voted against this resolution.

11. Globalization and Human Rights

**A/Res/57/205**      December 18      124–52(US)–5

Recognizes that, while globalization may affect human rights, the promotion of human rights is first and foremost the responsibility of the state, that the benefits and costs of globalization are unevenly distributed, and that only efforts at the global level can make it equitable, thus contributing to the full enjoyment of all human rights; welcomes the report of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights on globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of human rights; underlines the need to continue to analyze the consequences of globalization on human rights; and takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and requests the Secretary-General to further seek the views of member states and relevant UN agencies and to submit a substantive report on this subject to the General Assembly at its 58th session.

This resolution was adopted by a vote along North–South lines, with the United States voting No. The United States was concerned that the resolution did not recognize the complexities of the issues involved in globalization, including the benefits that globalization can bring. Some of the issues it addressed would be better considered in other forums. The resolution did not recognize the importance of domestic measures that must be taken to address the challenges of globalization. The negotiations reflected the significant disagreements between the resolution’s sponsors from the Non–Aligned Movement and its opponents, largely from Western Europe, on what globalization actually means.

12. Human Rights in Sudan

**A/Res/57/230**      December 18      80(US)–62–33

Expresses deep concern at the impact of the ongoing armed conflict on the situation of human rights and the adverse effects on the civilian population, and at the continuing serious violations of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and international humanitarian law by all parties to the conflict; urges all parties to the conflict to respect and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to adhere to agreements signed to facilitate peace agreements; calls upon the Government of Sudan to comply fully with its obligations under international instruments and agreements and to ensure full respect for human rights.

Sudan called for a vote and the United States voted in favor of the resolution. In explaining its vote, the United States affirmed its support for the resolution, while expressing regret that its language was not stronger in condemning issues such as slavery and religious persecution.



*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

13. Situation of Human Rights in Iraq

**A/Res/57/232**      December 18      97(US)–3–77

Strongly condemns the systematic, widespread, and extremely grave violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law by the Government of Iraq, including suppression of freedoms, summary and arbitrary executions, and systematic torture; calls upon Iraq to abide by its obligations under international human rights treaties, to bring the actions of its military and security forces into conformity with the standards of international law, to cooperate fully with the relevant mechanisms of the UN Commission on Human Rights, to establish the independence of the judiciary, to respect the rights of all ethnic and religious groups and cease repressive practices aimed at Iraqi Kurds in the north, and to cooperate with international aid agencies to provide humanitarian assistance; also requests the Secretary-General to continue to give all necessary assistance to the Special Rapporteur and decides to continue the examination of the situation of human rights in Iraq at its 58th session.

The United States cosponsored and voted in favor of this resolution. In the U.S. view, the ruling regime in Iraq continued to use fear, torture, and arbitrary execution to oppress the Iraqi people. Credible reports indicated that Iraq had the world's worst record for disappearances. Torture was routinely practiced on persons under arrest, both as punishment and to extract information. Saddam Hussein's regime refused to allow any measure of political freedom or independence and continued to restrict religious freedom. Freedom of speech was non-existent; newspapers and broadcast media were owned by the government, the Ba'ath Party, or individuals close to the regime. (Syria, Libya, and Sudan cast the only negative votes. Iraq could not vote in 2002 because it was in arrears.)

14. Situation of Human Rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DROC)

**A/Res/57/233**      December 18      92(US)–2–81

Welcomes the peace agreements signed between the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DROC) and the Republic of Rwanda, and between the DROC and the Republic of Uganda, and the continuing dialogue between the DROC and Burundi; significant foreign troop withdrawals from the territory of the DROC; the commitment of the Government of the DROC to cooperate with UN agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and the World Bank to prepare for and implement demobilization and reintegration programs; and the work of the UN Organization Mission and the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Condemns the continuing violations of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and international humanitarian law, including acts of and

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

incitement to ethnic hatred and violence and atrocities against civilian populations; all massacres and atrocities committed in the DROC; summary and arbitrary executions, disappearances, torture, indiscriminate attacks on civilian populations, recruitment and use of child soldiers, and widespread use of sexual violence against women and children; also expresses concern at the adverse impact of the conflict on the situation of human rights and its severe consequences for the security and well being of the civilian population throughout the territory of the DROC; urges all parties to the conflict to cease all military activities in the country, to implement all necessary measures to put an end to the widespread violations of human rights and to impunity, to respect international humanitarian law, to extend full cooperation to the UN system, humanitarian organizations, and the World Bank in order to ensure the rapid demobilization and reintegration of armed groups and of child soldiers in particular; decides to continue to examine the situation of human rights in the DROC, and to request the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights to report to the General Assembly at its 58th session.

Uganda called for a vote on the resolution which recognized actions by the Government of the DROC had resulted in a slightly improved human rights situation in the parts of the country under government control. However, as documented by the Special Rapporteur, the human rights situation had not improved in the eastern part of the DROC that was beleaguered by various armed groups.

The United States, having called for a vote on and voting against one paragraph containing language on the International Criminal Court (which was retained by a vote of 136–1(US)–30), voted in favor of the resolution as a whole. The only negative votes on the resolution as a whole were cast by Rwanda and Uganda.

15. Effects of the Use of Depleted Uranium

**Not Adopted**                      October 25                      35–59(US)–56

(Defeated in First Committee)

Iraq's draft resolution on the use of depleted uranium (DU) in armaments was defeated in the First Committee (an almost unprecedented occurrence), even though Iraq lobbied for it intensively. The resolution was substantially the same as its 2001 version, asserting that DU munitions are a health hazard and implying that DU is a new weapon of mass destruction. The resolution asked the Secretary-General to seek views of relevant organizations and member states on all aspects of the effects of the use of depleted uranium.

The United States and Denmark (on behalf of the European Union and its associated states) opposed the resolution. Pakistan also argued that the allegations that depleted uranium was a weapon of mass destruction could not be justified. The United States voted against this resolution because, in the U.S. view, the agenda of the General Assembly does not need an item on this sub-

#### IV - General Assembly Important Votes

ject, especially since the World Health Organization and the UN Environment Program have already conducted thorough and convincing studies. These studies, in turn, have concluded that the use of depleted uranium in armaments has not been shown to have a notable effect on the environment or on the health of human beings. Furthermore, the United States took exception to preambular paragraphs two and three of the draft resolution, which implied that depleted uranium could be considered a new type of weapon of mass destruction.

## IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The 19 important consensus actions listed and described below include 18 resolutions adopted by the Plenary and one decision. All were selected on the same basis used in determining important votes discussed above, i.e., they were “issues which directly affected U.S. interests and on which the United States lobbied intensively.” For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the document number, and date adopted. The first paragraph gives a summary description of the resolution, using language from the resolution (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs). Subsequent paragraphs provide background and explain the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in numerical order. The decision is listed last. Procedural decisions are less formal than resolutions and generally cover matters of lesser importance.

### 1. New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)

**A/Res/57/7**

November 4

Welcomes the final review and appraisal of the New Agenda for the Development of Africa (NADAF) in the 1990s by the Secretary-General, expresses disappointment at the limited progress of the program, and brings it to a close; welcomes the commitment of African countries to peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights, and sound economic management, and welcomes ongoing efforts of African countries to further develop the “African Peer Review Mechanism,” an important and innovative feature of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD); urges developed countries to increase Official Development Assistance (ODA), and encourages developing countries to ensure its effective use; further stresses the need to find a durable solution to the problem of external indebtedness of the heavily indebted poor countries in Africa; recognizes the essential role of trade as an engine for economic development in Africa, calling for improved market access for African exports within the framework of the World Trade Organization’s 4th Ministerial Declaration in Doha.

This consensus resolution was a victory for the United States, as it incorporated language on peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights, sound economic management, and the “African Peer Review Mecha-

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002

nism,” all key elements to a realistic, Africa–led agenda to solve the problems of that continent. The United States successfully eliminated draft language mandating increased ODA and transfer of technology, and directing international financial institutions to reduce “conditionalities” and change their lending practices.

NADAF is to be replaced by NEPAD, launched by the African Union on July 11, 2002 in Lusaka. The resolution created no new initiatives on Africa emerging from the UN system, in keeping with the new consensus that Africa’s development must be Africa–led and Africa–driven.

2. Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism

**A/Res/57/27**

November 19

Strongly condemns all acts, methods, and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomsoever committed; reiterates that criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons, or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstances unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other nature that may be invoked to justify them; urges all states that have not yet done so to consider, as a matter of priority, and in accordance with Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001), becoming parties to relevant conventions and protocols as referred to in paragraph six of General Assembly Resolution 51/210, as well as the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, and calls upon all states to enact, as appropriate, domestic legislation necessary to implement the provisions of those conventions and protocols, to ensure that the jurisdiction of their courts enables them to bring to trial the perpetrators of terrorist acts, and to cooperate with and provide support and assistance to other states and relevant international and regional organizations to that end. Urges all states and the Secretary–General, in their efforts to prevent international terrorism, to make best use of existing institutions of the United Nations; welcomes the effort of the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Center for International Crime Prevention in Vienna, after reviewing existing possibilities within the UN system, to enhance, through its mandate, the capabilities of the United Nations in the prevention of terrorism; invites states that have not yet done so to submit to the Secretary–General information on their national laws and regulations regarding the prevention and suppression of acts of international terrorism; invites regional intergovernmental organizations to submit to the Secretary–General information on the measures they may have adopted at the regional level to eliminate international terrorism; and welcomes the important progress attained in the elaboration of the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism during the meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee established by the General Assembly Resolution 51/210 of December 17,

#### IV - General Assembly Important Votes

1996, and the Working Group of the Sixth Committee established pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 56/88.

The United States joined consensus on this annual resolution, which reflects the long-term efforts of the UN community to fight terrorism. The United States supported the efforts of the United Nations to encourage all members to become parties to the 12 existing international terrorism conventions and protocols, including the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

### 3. Bilateral Strategic Nuclear Arms Reductions and the New Strategic Framework

**A/Res/57/68**

November 22

Welcomes the commitment of [the United States and Russia] to strategic nuclear warhead reductions in the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions, signed on May 24, 2002, which is an important result of this new bilateral strategic relationship which will help to establish more favorable conditions for actively promoting security and cooperation and enhancing international stability; notes with satisfaction the Joint Declaration signed by the United States of America and the Russian Federation in Moscow on May 24, 2002, which, *inter alia*, created the Consultative Group for Strategic Security, chaired by Foreign and Defense Ministers, through which the United States and Russia will strengthen mutual confidence, expand transparency, share information and plans, and discuss strategic issues of mutual interest; recognizes that the Group of Eight Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, launched by leaders at the Kananaskis Summit, held at Kananaskis, Canada, on June 26 and 27, 2002, will enhance international security and safety by supporting specific cooperation projects, initially in Russia, to address nonproliferation, disarmament, counter-terrorism, and nuclear safety issues; and invites all countries to join the Group of Eight commitment to the nonproliferation principles endorsed by the Group of Eight leaders at the Kananaskis Summit aimed at preventing terrorists, or those who harbor them, from acquiring or developing nuclear, chemical, radiological, and biological weapons, missiles, and related materials, equipment, and technology.

This resolution resumed the practice of introducing a U.S.–Russian sponsored resolution calling attention to achievements in bilateral nuclear disarmament. Russia readily agreed to a U.S. proposal this year to introduce a resolution highlighting the Moscow Treaty and the Joint Declaration signed at the 2002 Moscow summit. The resolution was adopted by consensus, securing a solid international endorsement of the Moscow summit's outcome and its value in meeting the nuclear weapon states' obligation under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to work towards nuclear disarmament.

4. Compliance with Arms Limitation and Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Agreements

**A/Res/57/86**

November 22

Recognizing that full compliance by states parties with all provisions of existing agreements and the resolving of compliance concerns effectively by means consistent with such agreements and international law can, among other things, contribute to better relations among states and the strengthening of world peace and stability, believing that compliance with all provisions of arms limitation and disarmament and nonproliferation agreements by states parties is a matter of interest and concern to all members of the international community, and noting the role the United Nations has played and should continue to play in that regard, urges all states parties to arms limitation and disarmament and nonproliferation agreements to implement and comply with the entirety of all provisions of such agreements; and notes the contribution that effective verification procedures for arms limitation and disarmament and nonproliferation agreements frequently can make in enhancing confidence in the compliance with those agreements.

The UN First Committee and the General Assembly last addressed compliance issues when the United States offered a resolution on this subject in 1997. Since then, much has happened to emphasize even more urgently the need for compliance with arms limitation and disarmament and nonproliferation agreements. The current U.S. Administration has repeatedly stressed the importance it attaches to compliance with bedrock agreements, such as the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The United States introduced this new resolution to increase international awareness of the need for full compliance with treaty obligations. The U.S.-sponsored resolution (with 42 cosponsors) was adopted without a vote.

5. UN Literacy Decade: Education for All

**A/Res/57/166**

December 18

Reaffirming that a basic education is crucial to nation-building, that literacy for all is at the heart of basic education for all and that creating literate environments and societies is essential for achieving the goals of eradicating poverty, reducing child mortality, curbing population growth, achieving gender equality, and ensuring sustainable development, peace, and democracy, convinced that literacy is crucial to the acquisition, by everyone, of the essential life skills that enable them to address the challenges they can face in life, and represents an essential step in basic education, which is an indispensable means for effective participation in the societies and economies of the 21st century, affirming that the realization of the right to education, especially for

#### IV - General Assembly Important Votes

girls, contributes to the eradication of poverty, appeals to all governments to reinforce political will, mobilize adequate national resources, develop more inclusive policy-making environments, and devise innovative strategies for reaching the poorest and most marginalized groups and for seeking alternative formal and non-formal approaches to learning; and decides that the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) should take a coordinating role in stimulating and catalyzing the activities undertaken at the international level that is complementary to and coordinated with the ongoing process of education for all.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution, in which member states reaffirmed their commitment to ensure that, by the year 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling with an emphasis on promoting literacy for all. States agreed that a basic education is crucial to nation building, that literacy for all is at the heart of basic education and that creating literate environments and societies is essential for achieving the goals of eradicating poverty, reducing child mortality, curbing population growth, achieving gender equality, and ensuring sustainable development, peace, and democracy. States also agreed that UNESCO should work to assist members in accomplishing this goal.

#### 6. Trafficking in Women and Girls

**A/Res/57/176**      December 18

Welcomes the steps taken to combat trafficking in women and girls by human rights treaty bodies, and urges governments to take appropriate measures to address the root factors that encourage this trafficking, be it for commercialized sex, forced marriages, and forced labor; urges governments to devise, enforce, and strengthen such measures, to consider signing and ratifying relevant UN legal instruments that oppose trafficking; calls upon governments to criminalize the practice in all its forms, to condemn and penalize the offenders, and to provide recourses in order to raise public awareness of the problem and provide comprehensive programs for the recovery of the victims.

The United States strongly supported the goals of this resolution, which are in line with Administration efforts and accomplishments in combating trafficking, such as enacting landmark legislation and helping other countries enact anti-trafficking legislation.

#### 7. Working Towards the Elimination of Crimes Against Women Committed in the Name of Honor

**A/Res/57/179**      December 18

Welcomes the activities and initiatives of states aimed at the elimination of honor crimes, including the adoption and implementation of relevant national

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

laws and social and other measures, such as national information and awareness-raising campaigns; welcomes too the efforts undertaken by UN bodies; expresses concern that women continue to be victims of such crimes and calls upon all states to fulfill their obligations under the relevant international human rights instruments, to continue to intensify efforts in this area, and to investigate promptly, to prosecute effectively, to document such cases and to punish the perpetrators; invites the international community, including relevant UN bodies, to support the efforts of all countries in this area; and invites the relevant human rights treaty bodies to continue to address this issue.

The United States supported and cosponsored this resolution, which was important for highlighting honor crimes, a form of violence against women that had received insufficient attention in the past.

8. The Girl Child

**A/Res/57/189**

December 18

Expresses deep concern about discrimination against the girl child and violation of the rights of the girl child, resulting in less access for girls to education, nutrition, and physical and mental health care, and being subjected to various forms of cultural, social, sexual, and economic exploitation and to violence and harmful practices, such as female infanticide, incest, early marriage, prenatal sex selection, and female genital mutilation; stresses the need for full and urgent implementation of the rights of the girl child as guaranteed to her under all human rights instruments; urges all states to take all necessary measures and to institute legal reforms to ensure the full and equal enjoyment by the girl child of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, to take effective action against violations of those rights and freedoms and to base program and policies for the girl child on the rights of the child; urges all states to enact and enforce legislation to protect girls from all forms of violence and exploitation, and to take special measures for the protection of war-affected girls.

The United States voted against operative paragraph one of this resolution in the Third Committee, noting that it was not a party to either the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CROC) or the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). The United States did not agree that there is a need for the universal ratification of the conventions nor that it had any obligations to implement any of the provisions. Although the United States is not a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, in practice the rights and protections that U.S. children have, through a multi-tiered system of national, state, and local laws, meet or exceed those protections enumerated in the Convention. The United States would have preferred to have its legal position, i.e. that decisions on accession to a convention rest with each state as a matter of sovereignty, taken into account.



#### IV - General Assembly Important Votes

While the United States appreciated the efforts of Namibia and the South Africa Development Community to seek a compromise, those efforts were not successful. Therefore, the United States requested a vote on operative paragraph one in order to record its opposition to the characterizations throughout this resolution of the CROC and CEDAW. The United States then joined the consensus and allowed the resolution as a whole to be adopted without a vote.

#### 9. Situation of Human Rights in Afghanistan

**A/Res/57/234**

December 18

Welcomes the Agreement on the Provisional Arrangement for Afghanistan (Bonn Agreement) and the election by the Loya Jirga of the Head of State, President Hamid Karzai, and the establishment of the Afghan Transitional Authority; welcomes the decision of the Transitional Authority to establish a Constitutional Commission to undertake the task of drafting a new constitution reflecting the commitment to promote and protect human rights; commends the steps taken by the Transitional Authority to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, to guarantee in particular the rights of children, women, and persons belonging to minorities, the rights to education, to employment, and to freedom of religion and expression; calls upon the Transitional Authority to develop the culture of democracy that includes democratic institutions as well as a free press and autonomous electronic media, all of which contribute to the promotion of tolerance and respect for human rights; notes with deep concern the severity of the humanitarian crisis still affecting the country and calls upon the international community to consider providing continued assistance to ensure an effective transition; urges the Transitional Authority and all Afghan groups to ensure the safety, security, and free movement of all foreign and local United Nations and associated personnel, as well as of all foreign and local personnel of humanitarian organizations; and urges the Transitional Authority and all Afghan Groups to guarantee the access of all Afghans to aid and to education and health facilities without discrimination on any grounds, including gender, ethnicity, or religion.

The United States joined consensus because it is committed to the universal principle that active support for human rights must be at the top of the international agenda. While the overall human rights situation improved in Afghanistan, much work remains to be done. The United States, through this resolution, demonstrated its commitment to assist the transitional government in its efforts.

10. High-Level Dialogue on Strengthening International Economic Cooperation for Development Through Partnership

**A/Res/57/250**      December 20

Stresses that the High-Level Dialogue, as the intergovernmental focal point for the general follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development and related issues, should contribute to promoting coherence among policies of development, finance, monetary, and trading organizations within the framework of the holistic agenda of the Conference with respect to eradicating poverty and achieving sustained economic growth and sustainable development and an equitable global economic system; and decides to reconstitute the current high-level dialogue on strengthening international cooperation for development through partnership as the High-Level Dialogue on financing for development so that it may become the intergovernmental focal point for the general follow-up to the Conference.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution because it made efficient use of an existing General Assembly mechanism. The biennial high-level dialogue on strengthening international cooperation for development through partnership that was in place before the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico in 2002 will be remade into a holistic, intergovernmental focal point for follow-up to the Conference.

11. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR)

**A/Res/57/256**      December 20

Welcomes the memorandum of understanding signed between the inter-agency secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) and the UN Development Program, and encourages the secretariat to pursue the establishment of similar arrangements with other international organizations in order to improve synergies and clarify respective roles; requests the Secretary-General to provide specific proposals to member states for the implementation of actions on disaster reduction agreed to by the World Summit on Sustainable Development in its Plan of Implementation; and also requests the Secretary-General to allocate adequate financial and administrative resources, for the effective functioning of the inter-agency secretariat for the Strategy.

ISDR is a UN program that helps governments develop disaster-resistant societies by enacting measures that upgrade building codes and protect populations from natural disasters like earthquakes and floods. Supporting a global strategy to reduce the risk to societies of natural disasters serves U.S. interests by saving lives and property, reducing the cost to U.S. taxpayers of disaster response, and reducing risks to U.S. citizens and corporations overseas. It also fosters good governance abroad, including by supporting the development of

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

the rights of women and other vulnerable minorities and strengthening the economic infrastructure of societies.

12. Protection of Global Climate for Present and Future Generations of Mankind

**A/Res/57/257**                      December 20

Calls upon all states to work cooperatively towards achieving the ultimate objective of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and notes the work of the United Nations towards this end; takes note of the Delhi Ministerial Declaration on Climate Change and Sustainable Development, adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change at its eighth session in November 2002; recalls the Millennium Declaration of September 2000; and notes that states that have ratified the Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change strongly urge the states that have not yet done so to ratify it in a timely manner.

The Millennium Declaration urged states to make every effort to ensure the Kyoto Protocol's entry into force. The United States made clear that it would not ratify the Kyoto Protocol or engage in efforts to ensure its entry into force. In this year's resolution, the United States considered the recalled reference to the Protocol, in the context of the Millennium Declaration, to be historical in nature and overtaken by changed policies and circumstances. The United States noted that the far more recent Delhi Ministerial Declaration reflected the current consensus for advancing on this issue. Therefore, the United States joined in the consensus.

13. Integrated and Coordinated Implementation of and Follow-up to the Outcome of the Major UN Conferences and Summits in the Economic and Social Fields

**A/Res/57/270**                      December 20

Decides to establish an open-ended *ad hoc* working group of the General Assembly, under the Chairmanship of the General Assembly President, to produce concrete recommendations to ensure an integrated and coordinated follow-up to the outcomes of the major UN conferences and summits; decides that the working group will submit proposals on how best to address the review of conference outcomes, including format and periodicity; and also decides that the working group will consider how to ensure that the conference outcomes are integrated into the programs of work of the UN system. Decides that the working group will commence its substantive work no later than January 2003, and will submit its report before June 27, 2003.

The United States cosponsored and joined consensus in adopting this resolution, believing that the working group will provide a good forum to press for

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002

more effective conference follow-up. The United States wanted more focus on implementation and achieving the objectives of the conference outcomes and on reaching the concrete targets and benchmarks agreed to by governments. The United States envisioned the working group recommending reform of the working methods and agenda of the General Assembly on development policy.

14. High-Level International Intergovernmental Consideration of Financing for Development

**A/Res/57/272**

December 20

Underscores its firm commitment to the full and effective implementation of the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development, and to promoting a holistic approach to the interconnected national, international, and systematic challenges of financing for development; reiterates that success in meeting the objectives of development and poverty eradication depends, *inter alia*, on good governance within each country and at the international level; recognizes that an enabling domestic environment is vital for mobilizing domestic resources, increasing productivity, reducing capital flight, encouraging the private sector, and attracting and making effective use of international investment and assistance. Encourages all governments to combat corruption, bribery, money-laundering, and the transfer of illicitly acquired funds and assets, and to work for the return of such funds and assets to the countries of origin; stresses the need for structural reforms to strengthen corporate governance, accounting, and auditing, in particular when inadequate policies can have systematic consequences. Considers that the multilateral trading system should be reinforced by achieving a balanced outcome of the Doha negotiations which responds to the interests of all the members of the World Trade Organization.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution to ensure effective follow-up to the Monterrey Consensus (the outcome document of the International Conference on Financing for Development). The Conference took place March 18–22, 2002 and over 50 heads of state and government and more than 200 ministers from around the world attended. President Bush's attendance at Monterrey and his announcement of a "New Development Compact" in advance of the Conference indicated the strong U.S. commitment to fighting poverty.

The Conference broke new ground as a UN development conference. The discussions centered on what really worked to promote development. The outcome document of the Conference stressed the primary responsibility of countries to advance their own development, coupled with international support.

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

15. Ensuring Effective Secretariat Support for Sustained Follow-up to the Outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development

**A/Res/57/273**      December 20

Reaffirms that the Conference constituted a new approach by the international community and that its implementation and follow-up should be given a very high priority in UN economic and social work; requests the UN Secretary-General to establish, as soon as possible, from within existing resources of the UN Secretariat, appropriate secretarial support arrangements for sustained follow-up of the agreements and commitments reached at the Conference; and decides that the functions of the new secretariat support structure should be of an integrating, cross-cutting, and holistic nature.

By joining consensus on this resolution, the United States affirmed the importance it attached to the goal of sustained follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development.

16. Proposed Program Budget for the Biennium 2004–2005

**A/Res/57/280**      December 20

Approves the preliminary estimate of \$2.876 billion for proposed program activities for the biennium 2004–2005.

The estimate provided guidance to the Secretary-General in his preparation of the detailed budget request for the next biennium. The detailed request, which will be presented to the General Assembly in 2003, reflected updated rates of inflation and exchange. The preliminary estimate was consistent with U.S. policy requiring budget discipline in the United Nations. The level was below the current UN budget of \$2.890 billion (as revised) and below the initial proposal of the Secretary-General of \$2.906 billion. Moreover, the resolution required the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive strategy paper to the General Assembly regarding the use of information technology in the United Nations. An additional \$29.8 million could be made available to the United Nations for information technology, subject to the General Assembly's favorable consideration of the strategy paper.

The United Nations initiated a process of management reviews of its program activities, a process the United States staunchly supports. During the debate surrounding the preliminary budget estimate for 2004–2005, the United States and other major contributors indicated their expectation that the reviews would lead to improvements in the way the United Nations formulates its budget priorities for the next biennium. The reviews also should generate proposals by the Secretary-General to terminate ineffective, marginal, and obsolete activities in the UN's program of work.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

17. Program Budget for the Biennium 2002–2003

**A/Res/57/293**                      December 20

Affirms that for the 2002–2003 biennium, the UN budget amount of \$2,625,178,700 appropriated in December 2001 shall be increased to a revised level of \$2,890,818,700.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution because the budget increase takes account of several new and unforeseen initiatives, which the United States strongly supported. These included enhanced security measures for UN facilities following the events of September 11th, enhanced UN special political missions in Afghanistan and in other regions, and the work of the UN's Counter-Terrorism Committee. The revised budget also reflected higher costs relating to other factors such as inflation and exchange rate fluctuations. The impact of exchange rates in the UN budget was attributable largely to the declining value of the U.S. dollar.

18. Strengthening the UN

**A/Res/57/300**                      December 20

Recalling the determination of member states to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for pursuing all the priorities set out in the UN Millennium Declaration, welcomes the efforts and initiatives of the Secretary-General aimed at further reforming the United Nations to cope with contemporary challenges and address new priorities facing the organization in the 21st century; and requests the Secretary-General to continue to take into account the views and comments expressed by member states and to respect fully the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly.

The United States strongly supported this resolution on the latest reform initiative of the Secretary-General, aimed at strengthening the United Nations. While respecting the authority of the Secretary-General as the UN's chief administrative officer to implement reforms, the resolution also emphasized the role of member states in approving and changing mandates. The U.S. delegation participated actively in the negotiating process and was able to gain support for language that would permit the Secretary-General to prepare a shorter, thoroughly revised program budget that reflects the priorities of the Millennium Declaration and is more closely linked to a shorter, more strategic Medium-Term-Plan; to improve management and coordination in the field of human rights; to restructure the Department of Public Information and the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Management; to create the new Office of the Under Secretary-General and Special Advisor on Africa; and to continue to reform Human Resources Management.

19. Natural Disasters and Vulnerability

**A/Dec/57/547**      December 20

Decides to consider the issue of natural disasters and vulnerability at its 58th session; and requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its 58th session on the negative impacts of extreme weather events and associated natural disasters on vulnerable countries, in particular developing countries, in a separate section of his report on the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR).

This decision endorsed, with U.S. support, the ISDR program, which aims at helping nations develop ways of reducing their risks to natural disasters. In the U.S. view, the proposed text overstated the state of knowledge, as reflected in UN scientific documents, with respect to what is known about the impact of global climate change on weather events. The United States was able to avert language inappropriately characterizing the relationship between climate change and natural disasters.

## COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 57th UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 14 important votes. (This listing only includes the Plenary votes.) In these tables, “Identical Votes” is the total number of times the United States and the listed state both voted Yes or No on these issues. “Opposite Votes” is the total number of times the United States voted Yes and the listed state No, or the United States voted No and the listed state Yes. “Abstentions” and “Absences” are totals for the country being compared on these 14 votes. “Voting Coincidence (Votes Only)” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes. The column headed “Voting Coincidence (Including Consensus)” presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 18 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes (This listing does not include the consensus decision). The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the second paragraph in this section.)

The first table lists all UN member states in alphabetical order. The second lists them by number of identical votes in descending order; those states with the same number of identical votes are further ranked by the number of opposite votes in ascending order. Countries with the same number of both identical votes and opposite votes are listed alphabetically. Subsequent tables are comparisons of UN members by regional and other groupings to which they belong, again ranked in descending order of identical votes.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**All Countries (Alphabetical)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan .....	1	7	0	6	58.8%	12.5%
Albania .....	5	6	2	1	77.7%	45.5%
Algeria .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Andorra .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Angola .....	1	9	4	0	65.6%	10.0%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	2	7	1	4	65.1%	22.2%
Argentina .....	5	7	2	0	76.7%	41.7%
Armenia .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Australia .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Austria .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Azerbaijan .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Bahamas .....	5	7	2	0	76.4%	41.7%
Bahrain .....	2	10	2	0	65.3%	16.7%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Barbados .....	5	8	1	0	73.3%	38.5%
Belarus .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Belgium .....	6	5	2	1	82.7%	54.5%
Belize .....	4	8	1	1	71.9%	33.3%
Benin .....	0	7	2	5	48.0%	0.0%
Bhutan .....	2	7	3	2	67.5%	22.2%
Bolivia .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	6	6	2	0	79.1%	50.0%
Botswana .....	1	9	3	1	64.9%	10.0%
Brazil .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Bulgaria .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Burkina Faso .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Burundi .....	2	9	2	1	63.9%	18.2%
Cambodia .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Cameroon .....	2	6	5	1	74.6%	25.0%
Canada .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Cape Verde .....	2	8	3	1	70.7%	20.0%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	14	*	*
Chad .....	0	4	2	8	65.6%	0.0%
Chile .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
China .....	2	8	4	0	70.9%	20.0%
Colombia .....	5	8	1	0	73.8%	38.5%
Comoros .....	1	8	2	3	63.8%	11.1%
Congo .....	2	10	2	0	64.0%	16.7%
Costa Rica .....	5	8	1	0	73.6%	38.5%
Cote d'Ivoire .....	1	9	2	2	63.7%	10.0%
Croatia .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Cuba .....	2	8	4	0	69.8%	20.0%
Cyprus .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Czech Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.3%	46.2%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	0	7	2	5	56.3%	0.0%
DPR of Korea .....	0	9	3	2	61.9%	0.0%
Denmark .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Djibouti .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Dominica .....	0	8	3	3	55.6%	0.0%



*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Dominican Republic ...	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Ecuador .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Egypt .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
El Salvador .....	5	6	0	3	78.2%	45.5%
Equatorial Guinea .....	0	7	2	5	37.8%	0.0%
Eritrea .....	2	9	3	0	67.8%	18.2%
Estonia .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Ethiopia .....	1	6	6	1	75.0%	14.3%
Fiji .....	3	6	3	2	76.3%	33.3%
Finland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
France .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Gabon .....	2	9	1	2	54.2%	18.2%
Gambia .....	1	9	2	2	61.6%	10.0%
Georgia .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Germany .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Ghana .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Greece .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Grenada .....	4	7	2	1	75.3%	36.4%
Guatemala .....	5	7	2	0	75.4%	41.7%
Guinea .....	1	10	2	1	63.8%	9.1%
Guinea-Bissau .....	0	1	2	11	54.3%	0.0%
Guyana .....	4	8	2	0	73.3%	33.3%
Haiti .....	1	10	2	1	64.0%	9.1%
Honduras .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Hungary .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Iceland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
India .....	3	7	4	0	75.0%	30.0%
Indonesia .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Iran .....	2	8	1	3	69.4%	20.0%
Iraq .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Ireland .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Israel .....	11	2	1	0	93.5%	84.6%
Italy .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Jamaica .....	3	7	4	0	74.8%	30.0%
Japan .....	7	5	2	0	83.3%	58.3%
Jordan .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Kazakhstan .....	5	8	1	0	73.5%	38.5%
Kenya .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Kiribati .....	0	2	0	12	40.4%	0.0%
Kuwait .....	4	9	1	0	71.0%	30.8%
Kyrgyzstan .....	4	8	0	2	63.1%	33.3%
Laos .....	0	8	1	5	60.8%	0.0%
Latvia .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Lebanon .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Lesotho .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Liberia .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Libya .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Liechtenstein .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Lithuania .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Luxembourg .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Madagascar .....	2	6	3	3	75.1%	25.0%
Malawi .....	1	8	4	1	67.5%	11.1%
Malaysia .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Maldives .....	4	9	0	1	69.1%	30.8%
Mali .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Malta .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Marshall Islands .....	8	1	0	5	94.6%	88.9%
Mauritania .....	1	9	3	1	66.4%	10.0%
Mauritius .....	4	8	2	0	72.6%	33.3%
Mexico .....	5	8	0	1	74.1%	38.5%
Micronesia .....	7	5	0	2	80.2%	58.3%
Monaco .....	6	7	1	0	76.1%	46.2%
Mongolia .....	4	9	1	0	68.9%	30.8%
Morocco .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Mozambique .....	1	10	2	1	58.5%	9.1%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Namibia .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
Nauru .....	5	8	0	1	72.7%	38.5%
Nepal .....	2	8	3	1	68.6%	20.0%
Netherlands .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
New Zealand .....	6	5	3	0	82.6%	54.5%
Nicaragua .....	5	6	1	2	77.3%	45.5%
Niger .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Nigeria .....	3	9	2	0	69.8%	25.0%
Norway .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Oman .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Pakistan .....	2	8	4	0	71.3%	20.0%
Palau .....	7	0	1	6	100.0%	100.0%
Panama .....	5	9	0	0	71.6%	35.7%
Papua New Guinea .....	2	8	4	0	70.0%	20.0%
Paraguay .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Peru .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Philippines .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Poland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Portugal .....	6	7	1	0	76.9%	46.2%
Qatar .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Republic of Korea .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Republic of Moldova ..	6	4	1	3	85.1%	60.0%
Romania .....	6	7	1	0	77.2%	46.2%
Russia .....	2	7	5	0	73.7%	22.2%
Rwanda .....	1	6	2	5	66.7%	14.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis .....	0	2	1	11	71.1%	0.0%
St. Lucia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
St. Vincent/Gren. ....	3	8	2	1	70.7%	27.3%
Samoa .....	4	8	1	1	70.9%	33.3%
San Marino .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Sao Tome and Principe ..	1	9	3	1	63.9%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Senegal .....	2	9	2	1	67.6%	18.2%
Seychelles .....	3	7	0	4	64.7%	30.0%

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sierra Leone .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
Singapore .....	2	7	5	0	74.1%	22.2%
Slovak Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Slovenia .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Solomon Islands .....	5	8	1	0	72.5%	38.5%
Somalia .....	0	7	3	4	57.6%	0.0%
South Africa .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Spain .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Sri Lanka .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Sudan .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Suriname .....	0	8	0	6	52.9%	0.0%
Swaziland .....	3	10	1	0	66.3%	23.1%
Sweden .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Switzerland .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Syria .....	2	10	2	0	65.5%	16.7%
Tajikistan .....	3	8	1	2	62.5%	27.3%
Thailand .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
TFYR Macedonia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Timor-Leste .....	3	5	0	6	65.0%	37.5%
Togo .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Tonga .....	2	6	2	4	71.8%	25.0%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	4	6	2	2	78.2%	40.0%
Tunisia .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Turkey .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Turkmenistan .....	1	6	0	7	49.7%	14.3%
Tuvalu .....	0	3	0	11	60.4%	0.0%
Uganda .....	1	9	2	2	66.9%	10.0%
Ukraine .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
United Arab Emirates .	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
United Kingdom .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
UR Tanzania .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Uruguay .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Uzbekistan .....	3	3	3	5	80.4%	50.0%
Vanuatu .....	0	3	2	9	69.9%	0.0%
Venezuela .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Vietnam .....	1	9	3	1	63.7%	10.0%
Yemen .....	2	9	0	3	66.6%	18.2%
Yugoslavia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Zambia .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Zimbabwe .....	0	8	2	4	58.7%	0.0%
Average .....	3.4	7.2	1.9	1.5	72.4%	31.8%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel .....	11	2	1	0	93.5%	84.6%
Marshall Islands .....	8	1	0	5	94.6%	88.9%
Palau .....	7	0	1	6	100.0%	100.0%
Australia .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Canada .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Japan .....	7	5	2	0	83.3%	58.3%
Micronesia .....	7	5	0	2	80.2%	58.3%
Netherlands .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Republic of Korea .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Republic of Moldova ..	6	4	1	3	85.1%	60.0%
Belgium .....	6	5	2	1	82.7%	54.5%
Ireland .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
New Zealand .....	6	5	3	0	82.6%	54.5%
Sweden .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Austria .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	6	6	2	0	79.1%	50.0%
Bulgaria .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Croatia .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Denmark .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Estonia .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Finland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
France .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Georgia .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Germany .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Hungary .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Iceland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Latvia .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Lithuania .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Luxembourg .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Norway .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Poland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
San Marino .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Slovenia .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Switzerland .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
United Kingdom .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Andorra .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Czech Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.3%	46.2%
Greece .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Italy .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Liechtenstein .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Monaco .....	6	7	1	0	76.1%	46.2%
Portugal .....	6	7	1	0	76.9%	46.2%
Romania .....	6	7	1	0	77.2%	46.2%
Slovak Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Spain .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
TFYR Macedonia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Yugoslavia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Cyprus .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Malta .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Albania .....	5	6	2	1	77.7%	45.5%

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
El Salvador .....	5	6	0	3	78.2%	45.5%
Nicaragua .....	5	6	1	2	77.3%	45.5%
Argentina .....	5	7	2	0	76.7%	41.7%
Bahamas .....	5	7	2	0	76.4%	41.7%
Guatemala .....	5	7	2	0	75.4%	41.7%
Barbados .....	5	8	1	0	73.3%	38.5%
Brazil .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Colombia .....	5	8	1	0	73.8%	38.5%
Costa Rica .....	5	8	1	0	73.6%	38.5%
Honduras .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Kazakhstan .....	5	8	1	0	73.5%	38.5%
Mexico .....	5	8	0	1	74.1%	38.5%
Nauru .....	5	8	0	1	72.7%	38.5%
Paraguay .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Peru .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Solomon Islands .....	5	8	1	0	72.5%	38.5%
Ukraine .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Uruguay .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Bolivia .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Chile .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Dominican Republic ...	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Ecuador .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Panama .....	5	9	0	0	71.6%	35.7%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	4	6	2	2	78.2%	40.0%
Grenada .....	4	7	2	1	75.3%	36.4%
Armenia .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Belize .....	4	8	1	1	71.9%	33.3%
Guyana .....	4	8	2	0	73.3%	33.3%
Kyrgyzstan .....	4	8	0	2	63.1%	33.3%
Mauritius .....	4	8	2	0	72.6%	33.3%
Samoa .....	4	8	1	1	70.9%	33.3%
Turkey .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Venezuela .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Kuwait .....	4	9	1	0	71.0%	30.8%
Maldives .....	4	9	0	1	69.1%	30.8%
Mongolia .....	4	9	1	0	68.9%	30.8%
Uzbekistan .....	3	3	3	5	80.4%	50.0%
Timor-Leste .....	3	5	0	6	65.0%	37.5%
Fiji .....	3	6	3	2	76.3%	33.3%
India .....	3	7	4	0	75.0%	30.0%
Jamaica .....	3	7	4	0	74.8%	30.0%
Seychelles .....	3	7	0	4	64.7%	30.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	3	8	2	1	70.7%	27.3%
Tajikistan .....	3	8	1	2	62.5%	27.3%
Nigeria .....	3	9	2	0	69.8%	25.0%
Swaziland .....	3	10	1	0	66.3%	23.1%
Cameroon .....	2	6	5	1	74.6%	25.0%
Madagascar .....	2	6	3	3	75.1%	25.0%
Tonga .....	2	6	2	4	71.8%	25.0%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	2	7	1	4	65.1%	22.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Bhutan .....	2	7	3	2	67.5%	22.2%
Russia .....	2	7	5	0	73.7%	22.2%
Singapore .....	2	7	5	0	74.1%	22.2%
Cape Verde .....	2	8	3	1	70.7%	20.0%
China .....	2	8	4	0	70.9%	20.0%
Cuba .....	2	8	4	0	69.8%	20.0%
Egypt .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Iran .....	2	8	1	3	69.4%	20.0%
Kenya .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Nepal .....	2	8	3	1	68.6%	20.0%
Pakistan .....	2	8	4	0	71.3%	20.0%
Papua New Guinea .....	2	8	4	0	70.0%	20.0%
Philippines .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Thailand .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
UR Tanzania .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Algeria .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Belarus .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Burundi .....	2	9	2	1	63.9%	18.2%
Djibouti .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Eritrea .....	2	9	3	0	67.8%	18.2%
Gabon .....	2	9	1	2	54.2%	18.2%
Ghana .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Lesotho .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Malaysia .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Morocco .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Namibia .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
Oman .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Qatar .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Senegal .....	2	9	2	1	67.6%	18.2%
Sierra Leone .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
South Africa .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Sri Lanka .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Togo .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Tunisia .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
United Arab Emirates .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Yemen .....	2	9	0	3	66.6%	18.2%
Zambia .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Azerbaijan .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Bahrain .....	2	10	2	0	65.3%	16.7%
Burkina Faso .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Cambodia .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Congo .....	2	10	2	0	64.0%	16.7%
Indonesia .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Jordan .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Lebanon .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Libya .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Mali .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sudan .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Syria .....	2	10	2	0	65.5%	16.7%
Ethiopia .....	1	6	6	1	75.0%	14.3%
Rwanda .....	1	6	2	5	66.7%	14.3%
Turkmenistan .....	1	6	0	7	49.7%	14.3%
Afghanistan .....	1	7	0	6	58.8%	12.5%
Comoros .....	1	8	2	3	63.8%	11.1%
Malawi .....	1	8	4	1	67.5%	11.1%
Angola .....	1	9	4	0	65.6%	10.0%
Botswana .....	1	9	3	1	64.9%	10.0%
Cote d'Ivoire .....	1	9	2	2	63.7%	10.0%
Gambia .....	1	9	2	2	61.6%	10.0%
Mauritania .....	1	9	3	1	66.4%	10.0%
Sao Tome and Principe	1	9	3	1	63.9%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
St. Lucia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Uganda .....	1	9	2	2	66.9%	10.0%
Vietnam .....	1	9	3	1	63.7%	10.0%
Guinea .....	1	10	2	1	63.8%	9.1%
Haiti .....	1	10	2	1	64.0%	9.1%
Mozambique .....	1	10	2	1	58.5%	9.1%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	14	*	*
Iraq .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Liberia .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Niger .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Guinea-Bissau .....	0	1	2	11	54.3%	0.0%
Kiribati .....	0	2	0	12	40.4%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis .....	0	2	1	11	71.1%	0.0%
Tuvalu .....	0	3	0	11	60.4%	0.0%
Vanuatu .....	0	3	2	9	69.9%	0.0%
Chad .....	0	4	2	8	65.6%	0.0%
Benin .....	0	7	2	5	48.0%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	0	7	2	5	56.3%	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea .....	0	7	2	5	37.8%	0.0%
Somalia .....	0	7	3	4	57.6%	0.0%
Dominica .....	0	8	3	3	55.6%	0.0%
Laos .....	0	8	1	5	60.8%	0.0%
Suriname .....	0	8	0	6	52.9%	0.0%
Zimbabwe .....	0	8	2	4	58.7%	0.0%
DPR of Korea .....	0	9	3	2	61.9%	0.0%
Average .....	3.4	7.2	1.9	1.5	72.4%	31.8%

## UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 14 important votes.

### African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritius .....	4	8	2	0	72.6%	33.3%
Seychelles .....	3	7	0	4	64.7%	30.0%
Nigeria .....	3	9	2	0	69.8%	25.0%
Swaziland .....	3	10	1	0	66.3%	23.1%
Cameroon .....	2	6	5	1	74.6%	25.0%
Madagascar .....	2	6	3	3	75.1%	25.0%
Cape Verde .....	2	8	3	1	70.7%	20.0%
Egypt .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Kenya .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
UR Tanzania .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Algeria .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Burundi .....	2	9	2	1	63.9%	18.2%
Djibouti .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Eritrea .....	2	9	3	0	67.8%	18.2%
Gabon .....	2	9	1	2	54.2%	18.2%
Ghana .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Lesotho .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Morocco .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Namibia .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
Senegal .....	2	9	2	1	67.6%	18.2%
Sierra Leone .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
South Africa .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Togo .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Tunisia .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Zambia .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Burkina Faso .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Congo .....	2	10	2	0	64.0%	16.7%
Libya .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Mali .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Sudan .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Ethiopia .....	1	6	6	1	75.0%	14.3%
Rwanda .....	1	6	2	5	66.7%	14.3%
Comoros .....	1	8	2	3	63.8%	11.1%
Malawi .....	1	8	4	1	67.5%	11.1%
Angola .....	1	9	4	0	65.6%	10.0%
Botswana .....	1	9	3	1	64.9%	10.0%
Cote d'Ivoire .....	1	9	2	2	63.7%	10.0%
Gambia .....	1	9	2	2	61.6%	10.0%
Mauritania .....	1	9	3	1	66.4%	10.0%
Sao Tome and Principe	1	9	3	1	63.9%	10.0%
Uganda .....	1	9	2	2	66.9%	10.0%
Guinea .....	1	10	2	1	63.8%	9.1%
Mozambique .....	1	10	2	1	58.5%	9.1%



***IV - General Assembly Important Votes***

**African Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	14	*	*
Liberia .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Niger .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Guinea-Bissau .....	0	1	2	11	54.3%	0.0%
Chad .....	0	4	2	8	65.6%	0.0%
Benin .....	0	7	2	5	48.0%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	0	7	2	5	56.3%	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea .....	0	7	2	5	37.8%	0.0%
Somalia .....	0	7	3	4	57.6%	0.0%
Zimbabwe .....	0	8	2	4	58.7%	0.0%
Average .....	1.5	7.8	2.4	2.3	66.4%	15.8%

**Asian Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Marshall Islands .....	8	1	0	5	94.6%	88.9%
Palau .....	7	0	1	6	100.0%	100.0%
Japan .....	7	5	2	0	83.3%	58.3%
Micronesia .....	7	5	0	2	80.2%	58.3%
Republic of Korea .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Cyprus .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Kazakhstan .....	5	8	1	0	73.5%	38.5%
Nauru .....	5	8	0	1	72.7%	38.5%
Solomon Islands .....	5	8	1	0	72.5%	38.5%
Kyrgyzstan .....	4	8	0	2	63.1%	33.3%
Samoa .....	4	8	1	1	70.9%	33.3%
Kuwait .....	4	9	1	0	71.0%	30.8%
Maldives .....	4	9	0	1	69.1%	30.8%
Mongolia .....	4	9	1	0	68.9%	30.8%
Uzbekistan .....	3	3	3	5	80.4%	50.0%
Timor-Leste .....	3	5	0	6	65.0%	37.5%
Fiji .....	3	6	3	2	76.3%	33.3%
India .....	3	7	4	0	75.0%	30.0%
Tajikistan .....	3	8	1	2	62.5%	27.3%
Tonga .....	2	6	2	4	71.8%	25.0%
Bhutan .....	2	7	3	2	67.5%	22.2%
Singapore .....	2	7	5	0	74.1%	22.2%
China .....	2	8	4	0	70.9%	20.0%
Iran .....	2	8	1	3	69.4%	20.0%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Nepal .....	2	8	3	1	68.6%	20.0%
Pakistan .....	2	8	4	0	71.3%	20.0%
Papua New Guinea .....	2	8	4	0	70.0%	20.0%
Philippines .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Thailand .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**Asian Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Malaysia .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Oman .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Qatar .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Sri Lanka .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
United Arab Emirates ..	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Yemen .....	2	9	0	3	66.6%	18.2%
Bahrain .....	2	10	2	0	65.3%	16.7%
Cambodia .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Indonesia .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Jordan .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Lebanon .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Syria .....	2	10	2	0	65.5%	16.7%
Turkmenistan .....	1	6	0	7	49.7%	14.3%
Afghanistan .....	1	7	0	6	58.8%	12.5%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Vietnam .....	1	9	3	1	63.7%	10.0%
Iraq .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Kiribati .....	0	2	0	12	40.4%	0.0%
Tuvalu .....	0	3	0	11	60.4%	0.0%
Vanuatu .....	0	3	2	9	69.9%	0.0%
Laos .....	0	8	1	5	60.8%	0.0%
DPR of Korea .....	0	9	3	2	61.9%	0.0%
Average .....	2.7	7.3	1.9	2.1	70.2%	27.1%

**Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
El Salvador .....	5	6	0	3	78.2%	45.5%
Nicaragua .....	5	6	1	2	77.3%	45.5%
Argentina .....	5	7	2	0	76.7%	41.7%
Bahamas .....	5	7	2	0	76.4%	41.7%
Guatemala .....	5	7	2	0	75.4%	41.7%
Barbados .....	5	8	1	0	73.3%	38.5%
Brazil .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Colombia .....	5	8	1	0	73.8%	38.5%
Costa Rica .....	5	8	1	0	73.6%	38.5%
Honduras .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Mexico .....	5	8	0	1	74.1%	38.5%
Paraguay .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Peru .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Uruguay .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Bolivia .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Chile .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Dominican Republic ...	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Ecuador .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Panama .....	5	9	0	0	71.6%	35.7%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	4	6	2	2	78.2%	40.0%

***IV - General Assembly Important Votes***

**Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Grenada .....	4	7	2	1	75.3%	36.4%
Belize .....	4	8	1	1	71.9%	33.3%
Guyana .....	4	8	2	0	73.3%	33.3%
Venezuela .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Jamaica .....	3	7	4	0	74.8%	30.0%
St. Vincent/Gren. ....	3	8	2	1	70.7%	27.3%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	2	7	1	4	65.1%	22.2%
Cuba .....	2	8	4	0	69.8%	20.0%
St. Lucia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Haiti .....	1	10	2	1	64.0%	9.1%
St. Kitts and Nevis .....	0	2	1	11	71.1%	0.0%
Dominica .....	0	8	3	3	55.6%	0.0%
Suriname .....	0	8	0	6	52.9%	0.0%
Average .....	3.8	7.7	1.3	1.2	72.4%	33.3%

**Western European and Others Group (WEOG)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel .....	11	2	1	0	93.5%	84.6%
Australia .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Canada .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Netherlands .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Belgium .....	6	5	2	1	82.7%	54.5%
Ireland .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
New Zealand .....	6	5	3	0	82.6%	54.5%
Sweden .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Austria .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Denmark .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Finland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
France .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Germany .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Iceland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Luxembourg .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Norway .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
San Marino .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Switzerland .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
United Kingdom .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Andorra .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Greece .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Italy .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Liechtenstein .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Monaco .....	6	7	1	0	76.1%	46.2%
Portugal .....	6	7	1	0	76.9%	46.2%
Spain .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Malta .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Turkey .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**Western European and Others Group (WEOG) (cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Average .....	6.2	6.0	1.8	0.1	80.1%	51.0%

**Eastern European Group (EE)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Republic of Moldova ..	6	4	1	3	85.1%	60.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	6	6	2	0	79.1%	50.0%
Bulgaria .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Croatia .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Georgia .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Hungary .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Latvia .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Lithuania .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Poland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Slovenia .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Czech Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.3%	46.2%
Romania .....	6	7	1	0	77.2%	46.2%
Slovak Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
TFYR Macedonia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Yugoslavia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Albania .....	5	6	2	1	77.7%	45.5%
Ukraine .....	5	8	1	0	74.2%	38.5%
Armenia .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Russia .....	2	7	5	0	73.7%	22.2%
Belarus .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Azerbaijan .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Average .....	5.2	6.7	1.8	0.2	77.3%	43.8%

IV - General Assembly Important Votes

**OTHER GROUPINGS**

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with U.S. votes for other major groups, in rank order by identical votes.

**Arab Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Kuwait .....	4	9	1	0	71.0%	30.8%
Egypt .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Algeria .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Djibouti .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Morocco .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Oman .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Qatar .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Tunisia .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
United Arab Emirates .	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Yemen .....	2	9	0	3	66.6%	18.2%
Bahrain .....	2	10	2	0	65.3%	16.7%
Jordan .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Lebanon .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Libya .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Sudan .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Syria .....	2	10	2	0	65.5%	16.7%
Mauritania .....	1	9	3	1	66.4%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Iraq .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Somalia .....	0	7	3	4	57.6%	0.0%
Average .....	1.8	8.7	2.3	1.3	67.3%	17.1%

**Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Singapore .....	2	7	5	0	74.1%	22.2%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Philippines .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Thailand .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Malaysia .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Cambodia .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Indonesia .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Vietnam .....	1	9	3	1	63.7%	10.0%
Laos .....	0	8	1	5	60.8%	0.0%
Average .....	1.7	8.6	3.1	0.6	68.6%	16.5%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**European Union (EU)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Netherlands .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Belgium .....	6	5	2	1	82.7%	54.5%
Ireland .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Sweden .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Austria .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Denmark .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Finland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
France .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Germany .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Luxembourg .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
United Kingdom .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Greece .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Italy .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Portugal .....	6	7	1	0	76.9%	46.2%
Spain .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Average .....	6.1	6.1	1.8	0.1	79.8%	50.0%

**Islamic Conference (OIC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania .....	5	6	2	1	77.7%	45.5%
Kazakhstan .....	5	8	1	0	73.5%	38.5%
Guyana .....	4	8	2	0	73.3%	33.3%
Kyrgyzstan .....	4	8	0	2	63.1%	33.3%
Turkey .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Kuwait .....	4	9	1	0	71.0%	30.8%
Maldives .....	4	9	0	1	69.1%	30.8%
Uzbekistan .....	3	3	3	5	80.4%	50.0%
Tajikistan .....	3	8	1	2	62.5%	27.3%
Nigeria .....	3	9	2	0	69.8%	25.0%
Cameroon .....	2	6	5	1	74.6%	25.0%
Egypt .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Iran .....	2	8	1	3	69.4%	20.0%
Pakistan .....	2	8	4	0	71.3%	20.0%
Algeria .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Djibouti .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Gabon .....	2	9	1	2	54.2%	18.2%
Malaysia .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Morocco .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Oman .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Qatar .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Senegal .....	2	9	2	1	67.6%	18.2%
Sierra Leone .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
Togo .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Tunisia .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
United Arab Emirates .	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Yemen .....	2	9	0	3	66.6%	18.2%
Azerbaijan .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Bahrain .....	2	10	2	0	65.3%	16.7%
Burkina Faso .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Indonesia .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Jordan .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Lebanon .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Libya .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Mali .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Sudan .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Syria .....	2	10	2	0	65.5%	16.7%
Turkmenistan .....	1	6	0	7	49.7%	14.3%
Afghanistan .....	1	7	0	6	58.8%	12.5%
Comoros .....	1	8	2	3	63.8%	11.1%
Cote d'Ivoire .....	1	9	2	2	63.7%	10.0%
Gambia .....	1	9	2	2	61.6%	10.0%
Mauritania .....	1	9	3	1	66.4%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Uganda .....	1	9	2	2	66.9%	10.0%
Guinea .....	1	10	2	1	63.8%	9.1%
Mozambique .....	1	10	2	1	58.5%	9.1%
Iraq .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Niger .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Guinea-Bissau .....	0	1	2	11	54.3%	0.0%
Chad .....	0	4	2	8	65.6%	0.0%
Benin .....	0	7	2	5	48.0%	0.0%
Somalia .....	0	7	3	4	57.6%	0.0%
Suriname .....	0	8	0	6	52.9%	0.0%
Average .....	1.9	8.1	2.0	2.0	67.0%	19.1%

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Yugoslavia .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Cyprus .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Malta .....	6	8	0	0	75.0%	42.9%
Nicaragua .....	5	6	1	2	77.3%	45.5%
Bahamas .....	5	7	2	0	76.4%	41.7%
Guatemala .....	5	7	2	0	75.4%	41.7%
Barbados .....	5	8	1	0	73.3%	38.5%
Colombia .....	5	8	1	0	73.8%	38.5%
Honduras .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Peru .....	5	8	1	0	73.9%	38.5%
Bolivia .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Chile .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Dominican Republic ...	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Ecuador .....	5	9	0	0	71.9%	35.7%
Panama .....	5	9	0	0	71.6%	35.7%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	4	6	2	2	78.2%	40.0%
Grenada .....	4	7	2	1	75.3%	36.4%
Belize .....	4	8	1	1	71.9%	33.3%
Guyana .....	4	8	2	0	73.3%	33.3%
Mauritius .....	4	8	2	0	72.6%	33.3%
Venezuela .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Kuwait .....	4	9	1	0	71.0%	30.8%
Maldives .....	4	9	0	1	69.1%	30.8%
Mongolia .....	4	9	1	0	68.9%	30.8%
Uzbekistan .....	3	3	3	5	80.4%	50.0%
India .....	3	7	4	0	75.0%	30.0%
Jamaica .....	3	7	4	0	74.8%	30.0%
Seychelles .....	3	7	0	4	64.7%	30.0%
Nigeria .....	3	9	2	0	69.8%	25.0%
Swaziland .....	3	10	1	0	66.3%	23.1%
Cameroon .....	2	6	5	1	74.6%	25.0%
Madagascar .....	2	6	3	3	75.1%	25.0%
Bhutan .....	2	7	3	2	67.5%	22.2%
Singapore .....	2	7	5	0	74.1%	22.2%
Cape Verde .....	2	8	3	1	70.7%	20.0%
Cuba .....	2	8	4	0	69.8%	20.0%
Egypt .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Iran .....	2	8	1	3	69.4%	20.0%
Kenya .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Nepal .....	2	8	3	1	68.6%	20.0%
Pakistan .....	2	8	4	0	71.3%	20.0%
Papua New Guinea .....	2	8	4	0	70.0%	20.0%
Philippines .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Thailand .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
UR Tanzania .....	2	8	4	0	71.4%	20.0%
Algeria .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Belarus .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Burundi .....	2	9	2	1	63.9%	18.2%
Djibouti .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Eritrea .....	2	9	3	0	67.8%	18.2%
Gabon .....	2	9	1	2	54.2%	18.2%
Ghana .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Lesotho .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Malaysia .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Morocco .....	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Namibia .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
Oman .....	2	9	3	0	68.6%	18.2%
Qatar .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Senegal .....	2	9	2	1	67.6%	18.2%



*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sierra Leone .....	2	9	2	1	65.8%	18.2%
South Africa .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Sri Lanka .....	2	9	3	0	69.0%	18.2%
Togo .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
Tunisia .....	2	9	3	0	68.8%	18.2%
United Arab Emirates .	2	9	2	1	68.2%	18.2%
Yemen .....	2	9	0	3	66.6%	18.2%
Zambia .....	2	9	3	0	68.4%	18.2%
Bahrain .....	2	10	2	0	65.3%	16.7%
Burkina Faso .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Cambodia .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Congo .....	2	10	2	0	64.0%	16.7%
Indonesia .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Jordan .....	2	10	2	0	66.5%	16.7%
Lebanon .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Libya .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Mali .....	2	10	2	0	66.1%	16.7%
Sudan .....	2	10	2	0	66.7%	16.7%
Syria .....	2	10	2	0	65.5%	16.7%
Ethiopia .....	1	6	6	1	75.0%	14.3%
Rwanda .....	1	6	2	5	66.7%	14.3%
Turkmenistan .....	1	6	0	7	49.7%	14.3%
Afghanistan .....	1	7	0	6	58.8%	12.5%
Comoros .....	1	8	2	3	63.8%	11.1%
Malawi .....	1	8	4	1	67.5%	11.1%
Angola .....	1	9	4	0	65.6%	10.0%
Botswana .....	1	9	3	1	64.9%	10.0%
Cote d'Ivoire .....	1	9	2	2	63.7%	10.0%
Gambia .....	1	9	2	2	61.6%	10.0%
Mauritania .....	1	9	3	1	66.4%	10.0%
Sao Tome and Principe	1	9	3	1	63.9%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
St. Lucia .....	1	9	3	1	66.0%	10.0%
Uganda .....	1	9	2	2	66.9%	10.0%
Vietnam .....	1	9	3	1	63.7%	10.0%
Guinea .....	1	10	2	1	63.8%	9.1%
Mozambique .....	1	10	2	1	58.5%	9.1%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	14	*	*
Iraq .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Liberia .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Niger .....	0	0	0	14	*	*
Guinea-Bissau .....	0	1	2	11	54.3%	0.0%
Vanuatu .....	0	3	2	9	69.9%	0.0%
Chad .....	0	4	2	8	65.6%	0.0%
Benin .....	0	7	2	5	48.0%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	0	7	2	5	56.3%	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea .....	0	7	2	5	37.8%	0.0%
Somalia .....	0	7	3	4	57.6%	0.0%
Laos .....	0	8	1	5	60.8%	0.0%
Suriname .....	0	8	0	6	52.9%	0.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2002*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Zimbabwe .....	0	8	2	4	58.7%	0.0%
DPR of Korea .....	0	9	3	2	61.9%	0.0%
Average .....	2.2	7.9	2.1	1.7	68.6%	21.8%

**Nordic Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sweden .....	6	5	3	0	82.8%	54.5%
Denmark .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Finland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Iceland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Norway .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Average .....	6.0	5.8	2.2	0.0	80.5%	50.8%

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Canada .....	7	4	3	0	86.2%	63.6%
Netherlands .....	7	6	1	0	80.5%	53.8%
Belgium .....	6	5	2	1	82.7%	54.5%
Denmark .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
France .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Germany .....	6	6	2	0	79.8%	50.0%
Hungary .....	6	6	2	0	79.9%	50.0%
Iceland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Luxembourg .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Norway .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Poland .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
United Kingdom .....	6	6	2	0	80.0%	50.0%
Czech Republic .....	6	7	1	0	77.3%	46.2%
Greece .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Italy .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Portugal .....	6	7	1	0	76.9%	46.2%
Spain .....	6	7	1	0	77.4%	46.2%
Turkey .....	4	8	1	1	73.2%	33.3%
Average .....	6.0	6.2	1.7	0.1	79.3%	49.1%

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2002 for both important votes and all plenary votes, in a side-by-side comparison.

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENT-ICAL VOTES	OPPO-SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENT-ICAL VOTES	OPPO-SITE VOTES	PER CENT
Afghanistan .....	1	7	12.5%	9	33	21.4%
Albania .....	5	6	45.5%	31	33	48.4%
Algeria .....	2	9	18.2%	9	61	12.9%
Andorra .....	6	7	46.2%	37	42	46.8%
Angola .....	1	9	10.0%	12	57	17.4%
Antigua and Barbuda ....	2	7	22.2%	15	42	26.3%
Argentina .....	5	7	41.7%	26	50	34.2%
Armenia .....	4	8	33.3%	22	53	29.3%
Australia .....	7	4	63.6%	38	35	52.1%
Austria .....	6	6	50.0%	36	41	46.8%
Azerbaijan .....	2	10	16.7%	14	51	21.5%
Bahamas .....	5	7	41.7%	21	56	27.3%
Bahrain .....	2	10	16.7%	14	61	18.7%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	18.2%	16	59	21.3%
Barbados .....	5	8	38.5%	26	57	31.3%
Belarus .....	2	9	18.2%	14	60	18.9%
Belgium .....	6	5	54.5%	37	37	50.0%
Belize .....	4	8	33.3%	17	58	22.7%
Benin .....	0	7	0.0%	6	26	18.8%
Bhutan .....	2	7	22.2%	8	42	16.0%
Bolivia .....	5	9	35.7%	26	63	29.2%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6	6	50.0%	35	34	50.7%
Botswana .....	1	9	10.0%	11	56	16.4%
Brazil .....	5	8	38.5%	26	58	31.0%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	18.2%	16	59	21.3%
Bulgaria .....	6	6	50.0%	37	38	49.3%
Burkina Faso .....	2	10	16.7%	16	60	21.1%
Burundi .....	2	9	18.2%	16	46	25.8%
Cambodia .....	2	10	16.7%	14	58	19.4%
Cameroon .....	2	6	25.0%	18	47	27.7%
Canada .....	7	4	63.6%	37	38	49.3%
Cape Verde .....	2	8	20.0%	14	59	19.2%
Central African Rep. ....	0	0	*	0	0	*
Chad .....	0	4	0.0%	3	28	9.7%
Chile .....	5	9	35.7%	27	61	30.7%
China .....	2	8	20.0%	13	61	17.6%
Colombia .....	5	8	38.5%	24	60	28.6%
Comoros .....	1	8	11.1%	9	47	16.1%
Congo .....	2	10	16.7%	14	61	18.7%
Costa Rica .....	5	8	38.5%	26	58	31.0%
Cote d'Ivoire .....	1	9	10.0%	11	56	16.4%
Croatia .....	6	6	50.0%	35	40	46.7%
Cuba .....	2	8	20.0%	12	62	16.2%
Cyprus .....	6	8	42.9%	34	49	41.0%

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENT-ICAL VOTES	OPPO-SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENT-ICAL VOTES	OPPO-SITE VOTES	PER CENT
Czech Republic .....	6	7	46.2%	37	40	48.1%
DPR of Korea .....	0	9	0.0%	7	57	10.9%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	0	7	0.0%	2	34	5.6%
Denmark .....	6	6	50.0%	37	39	48.7%
Djibouti .....	2	9	18.2%	16	62	20.5%
Dominica .....	0	8	0.0%	13	32	28.9%
Dominican Republic ...	5	9	35.7%	26	64	28.9%
Ecuador .....	5	9	35.7%	26	63	29.2%
Egypt .....	2	8	20.0%	15	60	20.0%
El Salvador .....	5	6	45.5%	26	54	32.5%
Equatorial Guinea .....	0	7	0.0%	2	21	8.7%
Eritrea .....	2	9	18.2%	18	60	23.1%
Estonia .....	6	6	50.0%	36	39	48.0%
Ethiopia .....	1	6	14.3%	13	53	19.7%
Fiji .....	3	6	33.3%	21	46	31.3%
Finland .....	6	6	50.0%	36	39	48.0%
France .....	6	6	50.0%	42	33	56.0%
Gabon .....	2	9	18.2%	5	39	11.4%
Gambia .....	1	9	10.0%	13	47	21.7%
Georgia .....	6	6	50.0%	32	39	45.1%
Germany .....	6	6	50.0%	37	38	49.3%
Ghana .....	2	9	18.2%	14	58	19.4%
Greece .....	6	7	46.2%	37	40	48.1%
Grenada .....	4	7	36.4%	22	57	27.8%
Guatemala .....	5	7	41.7%	26	47	35.6%
Guinea .....	1	10	9.1%	12	58	17.1%
Guinea-Bissau .....	0	1	0.0%	0	2	0.0%
Guyana .....	4	8	33.3%	20	59	25.3%
Haiti .....	1	10	9.1%	12	58	17.1%
Honduras .....	5	8	38.5%	25	58	30.1%
Hungary .....	6	6	50.0%	37	38	49.3%
Iceland .....	6	6	50.0%	37	39	48.7%
India .....	3	7	30.0%	14	52	21.2%
Indonesia .....	2	10	16.7%	17	60	22.1%
Iran .....	2	8	20.0%	14	57	19.7%
Iraq .....	0	0	*	0	0	*
Ireland .....	6	5	54.5%	34	42	44.7%
Israel .....	11	2	84.6%	63	5	92.6%
Italy .....	6	7	46.2%	39	39	50.0%
Jamaica .....	3	7	30.0%	20	59	25.3%
Japan .....	7	5	58.3%	34	36	48.6%
Jordan .....	2	10	16.7%	10	64	13.5%
Kazakhstan .....	5	8	38.5%	18	45	28.6%
Kenya .....	2	8	20.0%	17	57	23.0%
Kiribati .....	0	2	0.0%	0	6	0.0%
Kuwait .....	4	9	30.8%	22	61	26.5%
Kyrgyzstan .....	4	8	33.3%	9	32	22.0%
Laos .....	0	8	0.0%	3	53	5.4%
Latvia .....	6	6	50.0%	35	36	49.3%

*IV - General Assembly Important Votes*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENT- ICAL VOTES	OPPO- SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENT- ICAL VOTES	OPPO- SITE VOTES	PER CENT
Lebanon .....	2	10	16.7%	9	61	12.9%
Lesotho .....	2	9	18.2%	15	59	20.3%
Liberia .....	0	0	*	0	0	*
Libya .....	2	10	16.7%	14	65	17.7%
Liechtenstein .....	6	7	46.2%	35	42	45.5%
Lithuania .....	6	6	50.0%	36	38	48.6%
Luxembourg .....	6	6	50.0%	37	39	48.7%
Madagascar .....	2	6	25.0%	14	44	24.1%
Malawi .....	1	8	11.1%	12	49	19.7%
Malaysia .....	2	9	18.2%	17	59	22.4%
Maldives .....	4	9	30.8%	21	56	27.3%
Mali .....	2	10	16.7%	14	62	18.4%
Malta .....	6	8	42.9%	36	48	42.9%
Marshall Islands .....	8	1	88.9%	47	1	97.9%
Mauritania .....	1	9	10.0%	7	58	10.8%
Mauritius .....	4	8	33.3%	22	57	27.8%
Mexico .....	5	8	38.5%	23	62	27.1%
Micronesia .....	7	5	58.3%	53	6	89.8%
Monaco .....	6	7	46.2%	37	34	52.1%
Mongolia .....	4	9	30.8%	20	53	27.4%
Morocco .....	2	9	18.2%	10	58	14.7%
Mozambique .....	1	10	9.1%	12	51	19.0%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	8	20.0%	11	58	15.9%
Namibia .....	2	9	18.2%	12	53	18.5%
Nauru .....	5	8	38.5%	26	35	42.6%
Nepal .....	2	8	20.0%	15	51	22.7%
Netherlands .....	7	6	53.8%	37	37	50.0%
New Zealand .....	6	5	54.5%	33	42	44.0%
Nicaragua .....	5	6	45.5%	25	52	32.5%
Niger .....	0	0	*	0	0	*
Nigeria .....	3	9	25.0%	22	61	26.5%
Norway .....	6	6	50.0%	37	39	48.7%
Oman .....	2	9	18.2%	15	61	19.7%
Pakistan .....	2	8	20.0%	13	54	19.4%
Palau .....	7	0	100.0%	39	0	100.0%
Panama .....	5	9	35.7%	25	62	28.7%
Papua New Guinea .....	2	8	20.0%	19	40	32.2%
Paraguay .....	5	8	38.5%	26	60	30.2%
Peru .....	5	8	38.5%	26	53	32.9%
Philippines .....	2	8	20.0%	19	60	24.1%
Poland .....	6	6	50.0%	39	39	50.0%
Portugal .....	6	7	46.2%	37	38	49.3%
Qatar .....	2	9	18.2%	15	60	20.0%
Republic of Korea .....	7	6	53.8%	32	38	45.7%
Republic of Moldova ..	6	4	60.0%	34	34	50.0%
Romania .....	6	7	46.2%	37	39	48.7%
Russia .....	2	7	22.2%	21	48	30.4%
Rwanda .....	1	6	14.3%	13	32	28.9%
St. Kitts and Nevis .....	0	2	0.0%	9	14	39.1%

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENT- ICAL VOTES	OPPO- SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENT- ICAL VOTES	OPPO- SITE VOTES	PER CENT
St. Lucia .....	1	9	10.0%	13	59	18.1%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	3	8	27.3%	21	49	30.0%
Samoa .....	4	8	33.3%	21	47	30.9%
San Marino .....	6	6	50.0%	36	40	47.4%
Sao Tome and Principe	1	9	10.0%	11	57	16.2%
Saudi Arabia .....	1	9	10.0%	10	59	14.5%
Senegal .....	2	9	18.2%	19	63	23.2%
Seychelles .....	3	7	30.0%	7	42	14.3%
Sierra Leone .....	2	9	18.2%	17	50	25.4%
Singapore .....	2	7	22.2%	17	54	23.9%
Slovak Republic .....	6	7	46.2%	37	40	48.1%
Slovenia .....	6	6	50.0%	36	38	48.6%
Solomon Islands .....	5	8	38.5%	22	40	35.5%
Somalia .....	0	7	0.0%	3	42	6.7%
South Africa .....	2	9	18.2%	16	61	20.8%
Spain .....	6	7	46.2%	38	39	49.4%
Sri Lanka .....	2	9	18.2%	14	57	19.7%
Sudan .....	2	10	16.7%	14	68	17.1%
Suriname .....	0	8	0.0%	5	39	11.4%
Swaziland .....	3	10	23.1%	26	55	32.1%
Sweden .....	6	5	54.5%	35	41	46.1%
Switzerland .....	6	6	50.0%	35	39	47.3%
Syria .....	2	10	16.7%	10	66	13.2%
Tajikistan .....	3	8	27.3%	10	34	22.7%
Thailand .....	2	8	20.0%	19	58	24.7%
TFYR Macedonia .....	6	7	46.2%	36	40	47.4%
Timor-Leste .....	3	5	37.5%	12	25	32.4%
Togo .....	2	9	18.2%	16	60	21.1%
Tonga .....	2	6	25.0%	17	26	39.5%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	4	6	40.0%	26	58	31.0%
Tunisia .....	2	9	18.2%	10	60	14.3%
Turkey .....	4	8	33.3%	33	44	42.9%
Turkmenistan .....	1	6	14.3%	3	16	15.8%
Tuvalu .....	0	3	0.0%	1	12	7.7%
Uganda .....	1	9	10.0%	16	56	22.2%
Ukraine .....	5	8	38.5%	31	49	38.8%
United Arab Emirates .	2	9	18.2%	13	61	17.6%
United Kingdom .....	6	6	50.0%	44	33	57.1%
UR Tanzania .....	2	8	20.0%	18	59	23.4%
Uruguay .....	5	8	38.5%	26	57	31.3%
Uzbekistan .....	3	3	50.0%	13	13	50.0%
Vanuatu .....	0	3	0.0%	3	13	18.8%
Venezuela .....	4	8	33.3%	18	63	22.2%
Vietnam .....	1	9	10.0%	6	61	9.0%
Yemen .....	2	9	18.2%	13	61	17.6%
Yugoslavia .....	6	7	46.2%	36	40	47.4%
Zambia .....	2	9	18.2%	17	59	22.4%
Zimbabwe .....	0	8	0.0%	7	42	14.3%

IV - General Assembly Important Votes

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENT- ICAL VOTES	OPPO- SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENT- ICAL VOTES	OPPO- SITE VOTES	PER CENT
Average .....	3.4	7.2	31.8%	20.9	46.0	31.2%

